

**COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

**March 8, 2016 2:00-4:00 p.m.**

**Hill Hall 300**

**ATTENDEES: 2015-2016 Senators:** Ken Osgood (President), John Berger (ME), Linda Battalora (PE), Jurgen Brune (MN), Jason Ganley (CBE), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (HY), Chuck Stone (PH), Jay Straker (LAIS), Chet Van Tyne (MME). **Representatives:** Hanna Aucoin (GSG), Samara Omar (USG).

**APOLOGIES:** Graham Davis (EB)

**GUESTS:** Lisa Nickum (LB), Evan Wong (Oredigger).

---

1. Approvals and announcements

Past minutes (Singha)

**There was no opposition to approval of the 2/23/16 minutes.**

2. Visitors

2.1. Provost Update (Tom Boyd) – Tom Boyd not at meeting, no update.

3. P&T Process:

3.1. Handbook language review and approval (Osgood)

Senate discussed the draft of the P&T Process edits prepared by the senate. Regarding the external recommendation letters, at a public discussion that came out of the faculty forum, a DH suggested the implicit bias comment didn't need to be in the Handbook. Osgood then explained why it is important to highlight the issue and include it in the Handbook. Research shows that people evaluate women and minorities lower, even in STEM. Singha suggested combining the implicit bias statement for women and minorities. Osgood will insert a sentence, senators agreed. Senators then discussed adding a reminder to the P&T committee members about implicit bias.

Senators discussed the desirable number of external letters and whether the reviewers need to be professors. Berger thought letters could include experts from National Labs in addition to professors and suggested adding the word "primarily" in front of professors. Senators discussed how to determine external reviewers, senators agreed on language indicating "at least one third of the letters will come from the candidate's list of reviewers" and "the DH in consultation with the P&T Committee" will select 5-7 reviewers for the file. The dossier format identifies who suggested each reviewer. Osgood will add a sentence saying the DH should indicate who invited each reviewer. Senators also agreed language should indicate that the DH and the DPT should work together to develop the list of reviewers.

Paragraph D outlines voting and reporting conflicts of interest. Osgood changed abstain to recuse to indicate there must be a solid rationale for recusal. Senators discussed whether the DPT should communicate their UPT recommendation to the candidate. To reduce anxiety and possibly provide the opportunity for a rebuttal, Osgood will indicate in section F that the DH will share the review of the DPT in the event of a negative review. Martin noted at this point it has gone to the Dean. Senate suggested changing the order of the paragraphs. DH will prepare a recommendation letter and will share that with the candidate along with the feedback from the DPT.

Paragraph G indicates the involvement of the deans. Until now, the deans have not had a role in P&T. Regarding conflict of interest, senators agreed to “disclose the conflict and recuse if appropriate.” Additionally, UPT committee members from the candidate’s department should recuse themselves from voting. Language should be included that says, “parties reviewing the package can consult with anybody with pertinent information to this case” such as the DH or the chair of the DPT. Osgood suggested language, “to get more details or clarification at any stage, committee members can go to one of the levels that have already been involved to seek more information.” This request should come from the chair of the committee when applicable and should be included in the package. Senators agreed. Discussion of whether the chair should convey the committee’s overall view to the candidate; senators agreed that there does not need to be a report to the candidate from UPT.

Regarding deliberations taking place before all letters are in, Osgood will add language stating a vote cannot take place until all letters are received. Osgood will also ask President Johnson how he wants to be involved. Osgood will then present that information to the Handbook Committee. Osgood will finish the revisions then share them with Singha and Mehta for review. Senators agreed they don’t need to see the updated revisions. **Motion to approve document as discussed: Battalora, second: Brune. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

### 3.2. How to proceed with guidelines document

Osgood asked for a subcommittee to work on the P&T Process guidelines, Singha, Mehta, and Brune agreed to serve. Osgood will share the Survey Monkey results with Singha. He asked them to focus on interdisciplinary areas. Senators discussed whether attaching a dollar number to research is valued too much over publications and whether some important research is not valued because it is not associated with significant research dollars. Senators felt language should indicate dollars need to be enough to fund the faculty member’s research and students. Discussion of adding explicit language that states we are looking for research that has an impact but also add that funding is important to support impactful research. Subcommittee will draft language to present at the next meeting.

### 4. Forum discussions about ideas-in-progress

Osgood met with Johnson to share feedback that reflected senators’ concerns over demand scheduling. Johnson’s goal in implementing demand scheduling was to improve four year graduation

rates. Osgood told Johnson that senate needs to be involved in this type of policy decision so that senate can weigh in and give feedback as the process takes place to help with roll out. Johnson suggested having regular gatherings where people can brainstorm ideas, possibly billed as town hall or update meetings. He asked the deans to schedule these meetings. Stone suggested coffee sessions with five minutes of information followed by discussion. Potential topics include: faculty workload, organizational change related to groups like Honors, LAIS, EPICS, and programs that reach across colleges. The deans would preside over these meetings.

## 5. Campus Culture – moving forward

### 5.1 Senator Meetings with Departments update

Senators have met with CEE, GP, MN and are scheduled to meet with EPICS, AMS, ME, PH, GE and CH. Departments that declined to meet are EB and PE. Departments that have yet to set a date are EECS, CBE, MME and LAIS.

### 5.2 Plan for discussion on March 22

Osgood raised the question, what should we do using the campus culture information that we have gathered? Michelle Darveau, the new Assistant Director of HR has experience with organizational change. Osgood invited her to attend a senate meeting. He asked senators to bring a list of 3-5 ideas to discuss. Some ideas could be handled by the senate, some could be forwarded to the deans or administration. Stone will start a Google doc and Osgood asked senators to add their ideas to the document.

## 6. Other topics of discussion

6.1. Undergraduate Council Items (Ganley) – No report.

6.2. Graduate Council Items (Brune) – No report.

6.3. Research Council Update (Berger) – No report.

6.4. Handbook Remedies (Davis) – Davis absent, no report.

6.5. Library sub-committee (Van Tyne, Battalora, Martin) – No report.

## 7. New Items

7.1. Procedures Manual Revisions: Faculty Awards (Osgood) - No time to discuss, item will be moved to the next meeting.

7.2. Handbook update: appointment process and policy violations (Osgood)

Osgood reported the Handbook Committee is continuing to toil through items, he has been sitting in on the meetings to ensure senate items are supported. Paragraph nine of the appointment process is critical regarding how faculty will vote to ensure the will of the department is expressed. The appointment process has evolved a little from one year ago, indicating that faculty will vote. Dougherty has concerns about voting due to legal issues surrounding EEOC rules.

8. Executive Session began at 4:00 p.m.

8.1. Replacement for Roel Snieder

During executive session, senators selected Reed Maxwell to fill the senate position vacated by Roel Snieder.

8.2. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer

Senators voted to accept the DFL Recommendation Committee's recommendation for the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate Distinguished Lecturer. The recipient will be announced at the Faculty Awards Forum in April.